

Does this program crash?

```
def foo():  
    x = input()  
    f(x)  
  
def f(x):  
    if (x > 0):  
        f(x-1)  
    else:  
        g(x)  
  
def g(x):  
    1/x
```

**Yes!** When input = 0!

How do we **prove** this?

```
def foo():  
    x = input()  
    f(x)
```

```
def f(x):  
    if (x > 0):  
        f(x-1)  
    else:  
        g(x)
```

```
def g(x):  
    1/x
```

```
def foo():  
    x = 1  
    f(x)
```

Could try **testing**

```
def f(x):  
    if (x > 0):  
        f(x-1)  
    else:  
        g(x)
```

```
def g(x):  
    1/x
```

```
def foo():  
    x = 2  
    f(x)
```

Could try **testing**

```
def f(x):  
    if (x > 0):  
        f(x-1)  
    else:  
        g(x)
```

```
def g(x):  
    1/x
```

```
def foo():  
    x = 3  
    f(x)
```

Could try **testing**

```
def f(x):  
    if (x > 0):  
        f(x-1)  
    else:  
        g(x)
```

```
def g(x):  
    1/x
```

```
def foo():  
    x = 4  
    f(x)
```

Could try **testing**

```
def f(x):  
    if (x > 0):  
        f(x-1)  
    else:  
        g(x)
```

```
def g(x):  
    1/x
```

```
def foo():  
    x = 4  
    f(x)
```

```
def f(x):  
    if (x > 0):  
        f(x-1)  
    else:  
        g(x)
```

```
def g(x):  
    1/x
```

**Testing doesn't prove absence of bugs!**

Instead: **simulate** program with “abstract” inputs

+, -, 0

```
def foo():  
    x = +  
    f(x)
```

```
def f(x):  
    if (x > 0):  
        f(x-1)  
    else:  
        g(x)
```

```
def g(x):  
    1/x
```

**+ - 1 could result in 0!**



Instead: **simulate** program with “abstract” inputs

+, -, 0

```
def foo():  
    x = +  
    f(x)
```

```
def f(x):  
    if (x > 0):  
        f(x-1)  
    else:  
        g(x)
```

```
def g(x):  
    1/x
```

**Now consider f(0)...**

This process is called **abstract interpretation**

Approximate **infinite** behavior w/ **finite** runs

**Many** applications:

- Optimization
- Proving properties
- Enforcing security

# Detour: Information Flow

---

Which of the following leaks the input?

```
void foo(secret) {  
    send(secret);  
}
```



# Detour: Information Flow

---

Which of the following leaks the input?

```
void foo(secret) {  
    send(secret);  
}
```

If Barb knows the program, and sees some value  $v$ , she knows the secret was  $v$



# Detour: Information Flow

---

Which of the following leaks the input?

```
void foo(secret) {  
    send(secret);  
}
```

```
void bar(secret) {  
    send(0);  
}
```



# Detour: Information Flow

---

Which of the following leaks the input?

```
void foo(secret) {  
    send(secret);  
}
```

```
void bar(secret) {  
    send(0);  
}
```

Barb sees 0, can't learn secret



# Detour: Information Flow

---

Which of the following leaks the input?

```
void baz(secret) {  
    if(secret == 0) {  
        send(0);  
    } else {  
        send(1);  
    }  
}
```



# Detour: Information Flow

---

Which of the following leaks the input?

```
void baz(secret) {  
    if(secret == 0) {  
        send(0);  
    } else {  
        send(1);  
    }  
}
```

Barb sees 0, knows `secret == 0`,  
otherwise knows it was `!= 0`





# Detour: Information Flow

---

Which of the following leaks the input?

```
void baz(secret) {  
    if(secret == 0) {  
        send(0);  
    } else {  
        send(1);  
    }  
}
```

Barb sees 0, knows `secret == 0`,  
otherwise knows it was `!= 0`

This is called an *implicit flow*  
(Information leaked via control path)



Unfortunately, **no popular languages**  
readily enable enforcing information flow...

But possible to **verify** using abstract interpretation!

# Current work...

**Scale** program analyses to **supercomputers**

Verify security properties via program analysis

Building **new** languages w/ security built in from start